APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,919	07/14/2003	Aaron Cornelius	03797.00558	7973

28319   7590   08/22/2007
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER
CHOU, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/618,919	CORNELIUS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Y. Chou	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 June 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicant's Remarks dated 06/11/2007.

2.   Claims 1-30 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed on 06/07/2007 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

On page 7 of the Remark's section, Applicant argues that "no conceivable

combination of Okita et al. and Clauss et al. could disclose the claimed feature of

'displaying at least one proposed solution to a configuration error'".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to point to Clauss, paragraph

[0043], lines 10-16, "This additional information provides the user with information about

how to recover from the error."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Okita et al. US 6,225,998 B1 (hereinafter Okita) in view of Clauss et al. US

2002/0083377 A1 (hereinafter Clauss).

Claim 1:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user to configuration errors of shapes

representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method

comprising:

(a) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent at least one configuration error

associated with the shape (see for example column 15, lines 48-66, FIG. 5, item 504,

and related text); and

However, Okita fails to disclose a method of alerting a user to configuration errors of

shapes representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the

method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

a configuration error.

Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

a configuration error (see for example page 4, [0043], lines 10-16).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as

disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more

information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 2:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, further including:

(c) comparing shape configuration parameters of the shape to configuration parameter rules (see for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 3:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the configuration parameter rules are selected based on a context in which the shape is being used (see for example column 5, lines 26-41).

Claim 4:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein (c) is performed after (a) and further including:

(d) removing the icon when the configuration error no longer exists (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 5:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein (c) is repeated periodically (see for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 6:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein (c) is repeated when at least one configuration parameter of the shape changes (see for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 7:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 6, wherein (c) is repeated when at least one

configuration parameter of a shape other than the shape in (a) changes (see for

example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 8:

Clauss further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises a dialog box (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Claim 9:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the dialog box prompts a user to

initialize a variable (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 10:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the dialog box prompts a user to

set a configuration parameter (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 11:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises a wizard (see for example FIG. 3, item 302, and related text)

Claim 12:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises creating a new design element (see for example column 5 line 57-

column 6, line 4)..

Claim 13:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises adding a shape (see for example column 6, lines 58-65).

Claim 14:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises a necessary shape that is not connected to the shape in (a) (see for

example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 15:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises configuration parameters set in an inconsistent manner (see for

example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 16:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of the same shape (see for example column

15, lines 48-66).

Claim 17:   ,

Okita further discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of at least two shapes (see for example

column 15, lines 2- 14).

Claim 18:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user of configuration errors of shapes

representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method

comprising:

(a) displaying an icon next to a container shape to represent at least one configuration

error with respect to a shape contained within the container shape (see for example

column 15, lines 48-66, FIG. 5, item 504, and related text); and

Okita does not disclose a method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

the configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method

comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

the configuration error (see for example page 4, [0043], lines 10-16, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as

disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more

information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for

example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 19:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, further including:

(c) expanding the container shape to display at least the shape contained within the

container shape (see for example column 15, lines 23-32); and

(d) displaying the icon next to a shape contained within the container shape and that

contains the at least one configuration error (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 20:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the at least one configuration error comprises a necessary shape that is not connected to the shape contained within the container shape (see for example column 15 lines 48-66).

Claim 21:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the at least one configuration error comprises configuration parameters set in an inconsistent manner (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 22:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the inconsistent configuration parameters are configuration parameters of the same shape (see for example column 11, lines 53-61).

Claim 23:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the inconsistent configuration parameters are configuration parameters of at least two shapes (see for example column 11, lines 53-61).

Claim 24:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user of configuration errors of shapes representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method comprising:

(a) comparing shape configuration parameters of a shape to configuration parameter rules to identify configuration errors (see for example column 15, lines 48-64);

(b) determining a common error that causes the identified configuration errors (see for example column 15, lines 48-64);

(c) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent the configuration errors (see for example column 15, lines 48-64, FIG. 5, item 504, and related text).

Okita fails to disclose a method comprising:

(d) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to the common error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method comprising:

(d) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to the common error (see for example page 4, [0043], lines 10-16, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 25:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed solution comprises setting a configuration parameter (see for example column 5, lines 26-41).

Claim 26:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises creating a new design element (see for example column 5 line 57-

column 6, line 4).

Claim 27:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises adding a shape (see for example column 6, lines 58-65).

Claim 28:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the common error comprises a

necessary shape that is not connected to the shape in (a) (see for example column 15,

lines 48-66).

Claim 29:

Okita discloses in a computer system (see for example FIG. 1, and related text) having

a graphical user interface including a display and a user interface selection device, a

method of indicating configuration errors of elements displayed on a visual design

surface and representing software artifacts, the method comprising:

(a) displaying a plurality of the elements on the design surface (see for example FIG. 4,

and related text);

(b) displaying an icon next to an element to identify a configuration error associated with

the element (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Okita fails to disclose in a computer system, the method comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least

one proposed solution to the configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses in a computer system (see for example FIG. 1, and related text), a method comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least one proposed solution to the configuration error (see for example page 4, [0043], lines 11-12, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 30:

Okita discloses a computer readable medium (see for example FIG. 1, and related text) containing computer executable instructions for causing a computer system to perform the steps comprising:

(a) displaying on a design surface a plurality of shapes representing software artifacts (see for example FIG. 4, and related text);

(b) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent at least one configuration error associated with the shape (see for example FIG. 5, item 504, and related text).

Okita fails to disclose a computer readable medium comprising:

(c) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to a configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a computer

readable medium (see for example FIG. 1, item 640, and related text) comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least

one proposed solution to the configuration error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and

related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as

disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more

information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for

example page 1, [0010]).

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's Remarks filed on 06/07/2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed tot eh TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

AYC

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER